



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,669	02/06/2004	Steffen Dubnack	ZEI-3226/500343.20238	7534
26418	7590	04/03/2009	EXAMINER	
REED SMITH, LLP			EISEMAN, ADAM JARED	
ATTN: PATENT RECORDS DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
599 LEXINGTON AVENUE, 29TH FLOOR				
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7650			3736	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/773,669	Applicant(s) DUBNACK ET AL.
	Examiner ADAM J. EISEMAN	Art Unit 3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **16 December 2008**.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendments and arguments/remarks filed on 12/16/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciaff (US 2003/0100932) in view of Raymond et al (US 5,775,331).

Ciaff discloses an apparatus for the diagnosis and therapy of neuro-muscular and other tissue disorders comprising: placing a probe in an area of body tissue of a person to be treated (paragraph [0012]); stimulating the area of body tissue by causing the probe to send to the area different electrical and/or electromagnetic stimulus (paragraph [0012]) which can be pre-adjusted or modulated (paragraph [0006]); identifying any pathologically changed tissue parts in the area of body tissue by

identifying those tissue parts for which the person being treated provides no stimulus response or an unexpected stimulus response (paragraphs [0012]-[0013]); treating the area of body tissue wherein treatment comprises the probe selecting and/or removing any pathologically changed tissue parts (paragraph [0013]).

However, Ciaff does not disclose that if the tissue does not identify a pathologically changed tissue part, the probe is repositioned and new are of body tissue is stimulated; or that stimulation following repositioning can be carried out by iterative or continuous transmission of stimulus signals.

Raymond discloses a general method in tissue stimulation wherein a stimulus is applied, and if the stimulus does not identify a certain response, the probe is repositioned to a new area of body tissue to be stimulated again (column 5, line 8-column 6, line 60).

Regarding claims 1-2; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ciaff to include a step of repositioning the probe as taught by Raymond in order to test all tissue areas of a patient for pathologically changed tissue.

Further regarding claim 2; Ciaff discloses that the device can be programmed/controlled to carry out iterative or continuous transmission of stimulus signals (paragraph [0011]).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciaff in view of Raymond as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Zealear (US 4,817,628).

Ciaff as modified by Raymond above teaches direct stimulation is carried out by alternating the treatment and positioning of the probe for tissue stimulation and the immediate evaluation of the stimulus response; however it does not disclose warning the user and/or interrupting the treatment during treatment of critical tissue areas.

Zealear teaches an iterative tissue testing method where the user is warned during treatment of critical tissue regions (column 13, line 67 - column 14, line 9).

Response to Amendment

The applicant's amendments and arguments/remarks have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ADAM J. EISEMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3818. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571)272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AE
3/28/2009
/A. J. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 3736

/Max Hindenburg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736